

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the Office Action, at page 2, claims 1, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,132,026 to Taylor et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed because Taylor does not discuss or suggest:

head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer heads;

a slider to slide with respect to the head caps, and having wipers mounted on a front end portion thereof;

a slider movement unit to slide the slider; and

a revolution unit disposed between the head caps and the slider to revolve the head caps in association with the sliding of the slider with respect to the head caps,

as recited in independent claims 1 and 11.

Taylor discusses a pallet 62 that carries wipers 68 and a pair of caps 69. The pallet 62 is moved between a capped and an uncapped position. The pair of caps 69 is mounted to the pallet 62 using a printhead and/or carriage engaging cap elevation mechanism that includes a spring-biased sled 85, which is coupled to the pallet 62 by a pair of links 86 and 88. The sled 85 may be biased into the lowered position by a biasing member, such as a spring element 90.

Taylor exhibits the same problems as the Prior Art Figs. 1 and 2 of the present specification – namely that the volume of the inkjet printer from a front to a rear thereof is very large.

Taylor first does not suggest that the caps 69 revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer heads. The caps 69 merely move upward or downward in accordance with the movement of the sled 85. The caps 69 do not revolve, which requires that the caps 69 turn or roll round on an axis. The caps 69 in Taylor merely move between a first position (see Fig. 2 of Taylor or Fig. 1 of the present specification, for example) and a second position (see Fig. 2 of Taylor or Fig. 2 of the present specification, for example), but the caps 69 do not revolve about an axis. In contrast, as shown in Figs. 7 and 8 of the present specification,

the head cap 31 revolves (moves about an axis) from a capping position to an uncapping position.

Further, Taylor does not discuss that a revolution unit is disposed between the head caps and the slider to revolve the head caps in association with the sliding of the slider with respect to the head caps. Again, while the sled 85 moves from a first position to a second position, the sled 85 does not revolve the head caps 69 in association with the sliding of the slider 64 with respect to the head caps 69. The sled 85 moves from a first position (with the links 86, 88 in an angled placement) to a second position (with the links 86, 88 in a vertical placement). The sled 85 itself does not revolve, thus causing the head caps 69 to revolve.

In contrast, the revolving member 45 of the present invention is tilted downward against the guide 93 to cause the head caps 31 to revolve in a downward direction. Thus, the present invention of claim 1, for example, requires less space to cause the caps 31 to move from a capping position to an uncapping position.

Taylor, on the other hand, requires that the entire sled 85 be moved from a position adjacent the slider 64 to a position up and away from the slider 64, which requires more room to maneuver the head cap 69 from a capping position to an uncapping position. As the sled 85 does not revolve or cause the head caps 69 to revolve, the sled 85 requires more space.

Therefore, as Taylor does not discuss or suggest "head caps to revolve between a capping position and an uncapping position of printer heads;...and a revolution unit disposed between the head caps and the slider to revolve the head caps in association with the sliding of the slider with respect to the head caps," as recited in independent claims 1 and 11, claims 1 and 11 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends directly from independent claim 1 and includes all the features of claim 1, plus additional features. Therefore, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants are appreciative of the indication that claims 2-9 and 12-21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As it is believed that independent claims 1 and 11,

from which claims 2-9 and 12-21 ultimately depend, are allowable over the reference relied upon, claims 2-9 and 12-21 have not been rewritten in independent form.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 12, 2008

By: 

Kari P. Footland
Registration No. 55,187

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501